

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant :	Shunpei Yamazaki et al.	Art Unit :	1763
Serial No. :	10/826,920	Examiner :	Karla A. Moore
Filed :	April 19, 2004	Conf. No. :	1020
Title :	AN APPARATUS FOR FORMING A FILM AND AN ELECTROLUMINESCENCE DEVICE		

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF APRIL 18, 2007

In response to the action of April 18, 2007, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-28 are currently pending, of which claims 25-28 have been withdrawn. Of the claims under consideration, claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are independent.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 24 have been rejected as unpatentable over Yamazaki (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0006827) in view of Peng (U.S. Patent No. 6,641,674) and Japanese Patent 09-143697 (Hirata). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Yamazaki, Peng, Hirata, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or suggests the subject matter of independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, as described more fully below.

Claim 1 is directed toward an apparatus for forming a film. The apparatus includes a load chamber, a conveyance chamber connected to the load chamber and a film formation chamber connected to the conveyance chamber. The film formation chamber includes a first evaporation source, means that moves the first evaporation source, a second evaporation source, means that moves the second evaporation source, a third evaporation source, and means that moves the third evaporation source. The first, second, and third evaporation sources are movable in an X direction, a Y direction, and a Z direction in the film formation chamber.

The action indicates that Yamazaki and Peng fail to disclose that each of the first, second and third evaporation sources are movable in an X direction, a Y direction, and a Z direction. For this feature, the action relies on Hirata. More particularly, the action indicates that Hirata

discloses “means for moving evaporation sources in a vertical direction and across the length of a substrate for the purpose of extending the controllable range of a vapor-deposited film and for the purpose of shortening the response time from the point at which an adjusting action is taken to the point at which a change in vapor-deposited film do to the adjusting action is actually effected.” See action at page 3 (citing Figs. 1-5 and abstract). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Rather Hirata discloses “crucibles 10 and 11 are vertically and horizontally moved by using vertical actuators 18 and 19 and horizontal actuators 14 and 15....” Hirata at Abstract (referring to Figs. 4 and 5). As such, Hirata discloses vertical and horizontal movement. Thus, Hirata discloses, at most, movement in two directions, and does not disclose a third direction of movement as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, Hirata does not describe or suggest that the first, second, and third evaporation sources are movable in an X direction, a Y direction, and a Z direction in the film formation chamber, as recited by claim 1. As such, Hirata does not remedy the deficiency of Yamazaki and Peng. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 3 and 6.

Claims 7, 13 and 19 each recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 7, 13 and 19, and their respective dependent claims 9, 12, 15, 18, 21 and 24.

Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20 and 23, which each depend from one of independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, have been rejected as unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Peng, Hirata and Yamamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,179,923). Yamamoto, which is cited in the action for disclosing an installation chamber connected to the film formation chamber and connected to evacuating/exhausting means and with a mechanism for setting an evaporation material in the evaporation sources, does not remedy the failure of Yamazaki, Peng and Hirata to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20 and 23.


Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with the filing of this paper on the Electronic Filing System (EFS). In the event that any fees are due, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 18, 2007



Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331